

**REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action mailed February 19, 2004, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

The Office Action notes that Figure 5 should be designated by a legend such as -- Prior Art--. This has been done. A proposed drawing correction is submitted herewith for the Examiner's review and approval.

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

The Office Action pointed to specific instances in claims 1, 4, and 5 as lacking antecedent basis. Each of claims 1, 4, and 5 has been amended and these rejections should now be overcome. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 6-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, the Office Action asserted that, with respect to claims 6, 7, 17, and 18, the specification does not adequately describe how the first portion is "estimated", in such a manner that would allow one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection.

The concept of estimation and its implementation is fully described in the specification at, for example, page 6, line 19 – page 7, line 29. Accordingly, the specification clearly enables one of ordinary skill in the art how to make and use the claimed invention wherein the first portion is estimated. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 4, 6-8, 11, 12, 14-15, 17-19, and 22-23, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ho et al. Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a digital subscriber line transmission system comprising, *inter alia*, a processing circuit for making a local echo orthogonal, the processing circuit operating in the time domain only and comprising means for subtracting from a signal received on the subscriber line an estimated echo obtained using a filter from a signal portion following the end of the current outgoing symbol, and a beginning portion of the current outgoing symbol, wherein said portions have a duration at least equal to said predetermined time interval. Clearly, Ho does

not teach or suggest a processing circuit for making a local echo orthogonal that operates in the time domain only and comprises the means recited in claim 1.

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 6 recites, *inter alia*, in a digital subscriber line transmission system in which a at least a first outgoing symbol and a second outgoing symbol are successively transmitted, and a echoed first outgoing symbol and an echoed second outgoing signal are successively received, a method including the act of, *inter alia*, making the echoed first outgoing symbol and the echoed second outgoing signal orthogonal to the first outgoing symbol and the second outgoing symbol, wherein each of the first and second outgoing symbols includes a cyclic prefix. Clearly, Ho does not teach or suggest this limitation.

Claims 9-16 depend from claim 6 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 17 recites a digital subscriber line transmission system in which a at least a first outgoing symbol and a second outgoing symbol are successively transmitted, and an echoed first outgoing symbol and an echoed second outgoing signal are successively received, comprising, *inter alia*, a processing circuit for making the echoed first outgoing symbol and the echoed second outgoing signal orthogonal to the first outgoing symbol and the second outgoing symbol, wherein each of the first and second outgoing symbols includes a cyclic prefix. As discussed above in connection with claim 6, clearly Ho does not teach or suggest this limitation.

Claims 2-27 depend from claim 17 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Respectfully submitted,

Olivier ISSON and Tomas NORDSTRÖM

By: 

James H. Morris

Registration No. 34,681

WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.

600 Atlantic Avenue

Boston, MA 02210

Tel. (617) 720-3500

Attorneys for Applicants

Docket No.: S1022.80316US00

Dated: July 8, 2004